

ACTIVE CASES
Analysis April 2003 QA Results for Food Stamps
(as of 100% due date)

Sample Size: 99
(drops excluded)

Statewide Total April:

Total Issuance in Sample:	\$13,244.00
Total Number Error Cases:	10
Error Amount Total:	\$ 1,172.00
Percentage of Dollars in Error:	8.8%
FFY 2003 Error Rate YTD:	9.8%

Milwaukee County April:

Total Issuance in Sample:	\$ 6,492.00
Tot Number of Error Cases:	6
Error Amount Total:	\$ 648.00
Percentage of Dollars in Error:	10.0%
FFY 2003 Error Rate:	12.9%

Rest of State April:

Total Issuance in Sample:	\$ 6,752.00
Total Number of Error Cases:	4
Error Amount Total:	\$ 524.00
Percentage of Dollars in Error:	7.8%
FFY 2003 Error Rate:	7.2%

CHANGE REPORTING WAIVER (Phase 1)

A review of error cases that in the best-case scenario would not be considered errors under the new change reporting waiver shows the following results. **The error rate for April would look like this:**

- **Statewide Totals:**

Total Number Error Cases:	6
Error Amount Total:	\$781
Percentage of Dollars in Error:	5.89%

- **Milwaukee County Totals:** (under Phase 1 of Reduced Reporting)

Total Number of Error Cases:	5
Error Amount Total:	\$550
Percentage of Dollars in Error:	8.47%

- **Rest of State Totals** (under Phase 1 of Reduced Reporting)

Total Number of Error Cases:	1
Error Amount Total:	\$ 231
Percentage of Dollars in Error:	3.42%

Statewide, of the 10 errors, 3 were agency preventable errors, 1 was an error with W2 not included in FS budget, and 6 were client “failure to report” errors—5 of which would be considered non-errors under new waiver. Only one client non-reporting error would still be included as it exceeded the 130% FPL reporting threshold. Even that error could have been prevented had the Milwaukee worker only certified the case for 6 months rather than extending the cert two months.

Overview of the errors and where they occurred:

- Of the 6 client errors, half were in Milwaukee and half the rest of the state. In one case (reported as “client error”) the client made more money from working more hours. The Milwaukee agency worker had manually extended the certification period past 6 months, meaning QC was required to review using old rules of considering increases over \$25/month. If the certification had been 6 months, there would not have been an error.
- Of the 3 agency preventable errors, 2 were in Milwaukee.
- The remaining error was attributed to communication failure between Milwaukee W2 contract agency and the ES worker on W2 payment to be budgeted for FS.

Client non-reporting:

- 4 cases: clients didn’t report loss of earnings or unearned income source. These were under-issuances—which wouldn’t be errors under reduced reporting initiative.
- 1 case client failed to report new job. Would likely still be an error in future if put them over 130% FPL.

What types of errors are workers making?

- **Failure to correctly budget:** earned income; 18-yr-old student income; Social Security of child.
- **Failure to apply FS Application policy:** Milwaukee case, no evidence found of a signed application for FS. Agency unable to locate a case record. In absence of this, QA was required by FNS to use actual sample month circumstances in reviewing, which caused error. If the record had been found this could possibly have been found correct.

Trends or Possible Recommendations?

- Milwaukee has had several recent cases pulled for QC sample where the agency has manually extended the cert period past 6 months. April had an active case affected by this action. Because of it, the status reporting waiver (earned income) didn't apply and much more stringent reporting requirements were in effect, although the customer wasn't aware.
- Milwaukee County continues to have cases where they cannot locate the case file for QC to review, making it much less likely that the case will be found correct, without the needed documentation and proof of application. This seem to be more prevalent with application denials, which show up on the Negative Sample for review.
- The failure to monitor and budget 18-yr-old student income continues this month. It may indicate a need for training or reminders. Also possibly increase CARES alerts?

•

“Worst Cases” contributing to the error rate for April 2003 (including client errors):

(Lac Du Flambeau Tribal Agency) - \$231 APE error; agency failed to budget Social Security of a child in the FS group. The worker was aware of the income but didn't budget the income “because the money went to a Protective Payee, and so not available.” QA verified that the protective payee made the money available for the needs of the child, and is therefore countable.

Client error. \$237 error; client failed to report a new job and also receipt of Kinship Care. This may not have been an error under Reduced Reporting if she didn't exceed 130% of FPL.

(Milwaukee County) - \$123 APE error; agency failed to query, verify and budget earnings for an 18-yr-old in FS group. This would still have been an error under new Reduced Reporting policy if DXQW information on the Blockbuster job was available.

mbw

8/27/03